I

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 8 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 9 | |
| 10 | TAJHIKEEM WOODS,No. 2:15-CV-1474-JAM-CMK-P |
| 11 | Plaintiff, |
| 12 | vs. <u>ORDER</u> |
| 13 | KRAUSE, et al., |
| 14 | Defendants. |
| 15 | / |
| 16 | Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to |
| 17 | 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court are plaintiff's: (1) motion for leave to amend (Doc. |
| 18 | 8) and; (2) motion for the appointment of counsel (Doc. 5). Plaintiff's "Motion for Court Order |
| 19 | to Release Property" (Doc. 7) will be addressed separately. |
| 20 | Plaintiff seeks leave to file an amended complaint. Pursuant to Federal Rule of |
| 21 | Civil Procedure 15(a)(1), a party may amend his pleading once as a matter of right at any time |
| 22 | before being served with a responsive pleading. A review of the docket reflects that no |
| 23 | responsive pleading has been served. Therefore, plaintiff's motion will be denied as |
| 24 | unnecessary. Because no amended complaint was submitted with plaintiff's motion, the action |
| 25 | will proceed on the original complaint unless plaintiff files an amended complaint within the |
| 26 | time provided in this order. |
| | 1 |

| 1 | Plaintiff seeks the appointment of counsel. The United States Supreme Court has |
|----|--|
| 2 | ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in |
| 3 | § 1983 cases. See Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain |
| 4 | exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to |
| 5 | 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). See Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. |
| 6 | Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). A finding of "exceptional |
| 7 | circumstances" requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the |
| 8 | ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims on his own in light of the complexity of the legal |
| 9 | issues involved. See Terrell, 935 F.2d at 1017. Neither factor is dispositive and both must be |
| 10 | viewed together before reaching a decision. See id. |
| 11 | In the present case, the court does not at this time find the required exceptional |
| 12 | circumstances. Specifically, plaintiff has demonstrated an ability to present articulate pleadings |
| 13 | and motions to this court. In addition, given plaintiff's apparent intention to amend his |
| 14 | complaint, the court cannot say at this stage in the proceedings that plaintiff has a likelihood of |
| 15 | success on the merits. |
| 16 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: |
| 17 | 1. Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel (Doc. 5) is denied; |
| 18 | 2. Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend (Doc. 8) is denied as unnecessary; |
| 19 | and |
| 20 | 3. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint within 30 days of the date of this |
| 21 | order. |
| 22 | |
| 23 | DATED: March 10, 2016 |
| 24 | CRAIG M. KELLISON |
| 25 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 26 | |
| | 2 |
| | |

I